APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,700	09/22/2000	Joachim Kim	44400.010100	2337

33893	7590	03/20/2006

JEFFREY L. BRANDT
c/o PORTFOLIO IP
P.O. BOX 52050
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
USTARIS, JOSEPH G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/668,700	KIM, JOACHIM
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph G. Ustaris	2617	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 January 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-48,50-52 and 54-74* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *73 and 74* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-48,50-52 and 54-72* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *57* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is in response to the amendment dated 09 January 2006 in

application 09/668,700. Claims 1-4, 7-48, 50-52, and 54-72 are pending. Claims 1, 9,

16, 17, 50-52, 54-57, 60 are amended.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09

January 2006 has been entered.

The objection to the Oath/Declaration and claims 5, 6, and 68 are now

withdrawn in view of the amendments.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 57 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 57 has an

incorrect status identifier. The correct status identifier should be Currently Amended.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 25, 27, 29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 25, 27, 29, and 31 recite that each media block begins with a delta frame. The specification discloses a delta frame to be a frame that represents only the changes from the previous frame (See specification page 22 lines 15-17). However, no evidence is found within the specification to support that the "media blocks begins with a delta frame". The specification does disclose that each "media block" begins with a full frame (See specification Fig. 2 and page 22 lines 4-12 and lines 17-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 24, 26, 28, 30, 44-48, 50-52, 54-57, 60, and 69-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ottesen et al. (US005930493A) in view of Shirakawa et al. (US006539164B2).

Regarding claim 1, Ottesen et al. (Ottesen) discloses a multimedia server system

that is utilized over a network (See column 8 lines 18-35). The multimedia server or

"capture server" comprises one or more mass storage devices or "data storage device"

that stores multimedia programs or "time sequenced media content" in an addressable

manner. The multimedia server uses a coder or "encoder" to convert analog audio/video

signals received from a broadcast channel or "media signal" into a digital format,

wherein inherently the video in digital form comprises digital frames (See Fig. 4 and

column 9 lines 25-67). The index parsers or "converter" then divides the compressed

digital multimedia program into a plurality of video segments or "plurality of sequential

media blocks", wherein the segments contain consecutively ordered full-motion video

portions or "consecutive number of digital frames" and inherently the corresponding

audio (See column 9 lines 25-45 and column 10 lines 45-51). The index parsers also

serve the functions of the "storage manager" and "storing processor" by encoding a

unique segment address to the video segments and storing the segments within the

storage device so that the segments can be easily located (See column 9 line 45 –

column 10 line 10). However, Ottesen does not explicitly disclose "each media block

begins with a whole frame".

Ottesen does disclose that the MPEG coding standard is one of many coding

techniques that is used (See Ottesen column 7 lines 42-65). Shirakawa et al.

(Shirakawa) discloses a system for recording/playback of video using MPEG standards.

The video is coded into a plurality of group of pictures (GOPs) or "plurality of media

blocks" that consists of frames (See Figs. 1a and 43). Each GOP begins with an intra-

frame (I-frame) or "whole frame" (See Figs. 1a and 43; column 24 lines 22-37 and column 25 line 30 – column 26 line 30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify each of the video segments disclosed by Ottesen to begin with a "whole frame", as taught by Shirakawa, in order to enable high-speed retrieval and display of any selected image that is recorded on the storage device (See Shirakawa column 6 lines 39-41, column 8 lines 62-63, and column 26 lines 11-14). Furthermore, Ottesen discloses that the multimedia server is also the "distribution server", where it "distributes requested media blocks from the data storage device" (See Ottesen Fig. 3, mass storage library, distribution switch, and communication channel). The "requested media blocks begin with a whole frame" as disclosed by Shirakawa above.

Regarding claim 2, the segments are representative of a predetermined amount of full-motion video or "predetermined number of digital frames" (See Ottesen column 9 lines 30-45 and column 11 lines 39-45).

Regarding claim 3, the network is a wide-area network (See Ottesen column 8 lines 18-34).

Regarding claim 4, the network is also a "storage area network", wherein the storage devices are located at a plurality of sites within the network (See Ottesen column 8 lines 18-34).

Regarding claim 7, the predetermined amount is either one or two seconds of full motion video or "period between 1 second and 5 minutes" (See Ottesen column 9 lines 25-45 and column 10 lines 45-65).

Claim 9 contains the limitations of claim 1 (wherein the multimedia server can receive a digital signal or "digital media signal" (See Ottesen column 10 lines 40-45)) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim.

Claim 10 contains the limitations of claims 2 and 9 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 11 contains the limitations of claims 3 and 9 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 12 contains the limitations of claims 4 and 9 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 13, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa does not disclose the additional feature where the received digital media signal is an MPEG signal.

Official Notice is taken that it is well known to transmit and receive digital signals in an MPEG format. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the digital signal received by the multimedia server disclosed by Ottesen in view of Shirakawa to be a MPEG signal so that the signal would be in accordance with a well known and established compression thereby ensuring greater compatibility between servers.

Claim 14 contains the limitations of claims 7 and 10 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 16 contains the limitations of claims 1 and 9 (wherein the system performs the method) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 17 contains the limitations of claims 1 and 9 (wherein the system performs

the method) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 24, the "whole frame" is an I-frame or "full frame" (See

Shirakawa column 3 lines 31-32).

Claim 26 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 24 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 28 contains the limitations of claims 16 and 24 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 30 contains the limitations of claims 17 and 24 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 44, inherently the "media blocks are searchable" in order to

retrieve and display any selected video (See Shirakawa column 26 lines 11-14).

Claim 45 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 44 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 46, the coder is a MPEG encoder (See Ottesen column 10 lines

65-67 and column 11 lines 15-20).

Regarding claim 47, the multimedia server receives multimedia programs from a

broadcast channel or "broadcast channel television signal" (See Ottesen column 10

lines 40-45).

Claim 48 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 47 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 50, "the distributed blocks of media are viewable from any point in one of the blocks of media data" (See Shirakawa Fig. 1a; column 26 lines 11-14).

Regarding claim 51, "the distribution server throttles the distribution of the blocks of media data" (See Ottesen column 13 line 63 – column 14 line 7).

Regarding claim 52, "the distribution server stitches" the video segments or "blocks of media data" together prior to distribution (See Ottesen Fig. 6; column 12 lines 6-34).

Claim 54 contains the limitations of claims 50 and 53 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 55 contains the limitations of claims 51 and 53 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 56 contains the limitations of claims 52 and 53 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 57, "a plurality of the distribution servers adapted to distribute blocks of media data stored in the data storage device" (See Ottesen Figs. 1-3).

Claim 60 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 57 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 69, the network is a wide-area network or "logical network"(See Ottesen column 8 lines 18-34). Furthermore, the "data storage device and capture server are located within" the media server or "a single computer" (See Ottesen Fig. 3).

Claim 70 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 69 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 71, the multimedia server can arrange a sequential stream that represents a "consecutive number digital frames corresponding to a period of up to 2 hours" (See Ottesen column 14 lines 15-22).

Claim 72 contains the limitations of claims 10 and 71 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ottesen et al. (US005930493A) in view of Shirakawa et al. (US006539164B2) as applied to claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 24, 26, 28, 30, 44-48, 50-52, 54-57, 60, and 69-72 above, and further in view of DuLac (US005899582A).

Regarding claim 8, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa does not disclose a system where the predetermined amount is a period of approximately 1 minute.

Ottesen suggests that the segments can represent portions of video more than one second (See column 9 lines 40-45). DuLac discloses a movie-on-demand disk storage system. Digital movies that are stored on disk are divided into one or two minute segments (See column 2 line 65 – column 3 line 7 and column 3 lines 15-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the index parsers of the multimedia server disclosed by Ottesen in view of Shirakawa to divide the compressed video into segments representative of approximately 1 minute, as taught by DuLac, in order to reduce the seek and access time for searching segments, thus enabling the system to respond quicker to user's VCR-type control commands.

Claim 15 contains the limitations of claims 8 and 10 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claims 18-23, 32, 33, 35-38, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Ottesen et al. (US005930493A) in view of Shirakawa et al.

(US006539164B2) as applied to claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 24, 26, 28, 30, 44-48, 50-

52, 54-57, 60, and 69-72 above, and further in view of Jain et al. (US006360234B2).

Regarding claim 18, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa does not disclose "a close

caption manager" for storing "closed caption data as a text media block associated with

the media blocks in the data storage device".

Jain et al. (Jain) discloses a video cataloger system that is able to store and

index videos using various information from the video source. The server includes a

closed caption text decoder that is able to extract and save the text of the closed

caption data and associates it with the video (See Fig. 3, 6, and 7; column 4 lines 44-51

and column 6 lines 39-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multimedia server

disclosed by Ottesen in view of Shirakawa to include "a close caption manager" for

storing "closed caption data as a text media block associated with the media blocks in

the data storage device", as taught by Jain, in order to enhance the capabilities of the

system thereby allowing the user to locate items in a video using the closed caption

data.

Regarding claim 19, when the user clicks on the closed caption text or "text media block", it invokes the corresponding key-frames or "triggers an action based at least upon a rule" (See Jain column 13 lines 20-26).

Regarding claim 20, the closed caption text is "searchable for locating one or more media blocks" (See Jain column 2 lines 8-30).

Claim 21 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 18 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 22 contains the limitations of claims 19 and 21 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 23 contains the limitations of claims 20 and 21 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 32 contains the limitations of claims 1 and 18 (wherein the system is able to also extract and store "searchable meta-data", where inherently it is connected to the network via the server (See Jain Figs. 6 and 7)) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 33, the "meta-data identifies program information pertaining to the media data" (See Jain column 6 lines 48-67).

Regarding claim 35, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa and in further view of Jain does not disclose "meta-data identifying mime information".

Official Notice is taken that it is well known to include information that specifies the type of data or "mime information". Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the meta-data

disclosed by Ottesen in view of Shirakawa and in further view of Jain to include

information that specifies the type of data or "mime information" in order to increase the

efficiency of the system by enabling the system to quickly identify the data type.

Regarding claim 36, the "meta-data identifies video clip information pertaining to

the media data" (See Jain column 6 lines 48-67).

Claim 37 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 32 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 38 contains the limitations of claims 33 and 37 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 40 contains the limitations of claims 35 and 37 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 41 contains the limitations of claims 36 and 37 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claims 34 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Ottesen et al. (US005930493A) in view of Shirakawa et al. (US006539164B2) and

in further view of Jain et al. (US006360234B2) as applied to claims 18-23, 32, 33, 35-

38, 40, and 41 above, and further in view of Fries (US006317885B1).

Regarding claim 34, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa and in further view of Jain

does not disclose "meta-data identifying channel information".

Fries discloses an interactive entertainment and information system that reads

meta-data and takes action based on the information contained in the meta-data. The

meta-data contains various information, e.g. the digital channel or "channel information" that corresponds to the content being used by the user (See column 9 lines 32-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the meta-data disclosed by Ottesen in view of Shirakawa and in further view of Jain to include "channel information", as taught by Fries, in order to in order to increase the efficiency of the system by enabling the system to quickly locate the channel.

Claim 39 contains the limitations of claims 34 and 37 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ottesen et al. (US005930493A) in view of Shirakawa et al. (US006539164B2) as applied to claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 24, 26, 28, 30, 44-48, 50-52, 54-57, 60, and 69-72 above, and further in view of Milewski et al. (US006289346B1).

Regarding claim 42, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa does not disclose that the "address determined by the storage manager is identifiable using a URL".

Milewski et al. (Milewski) discloses a book marking system that is able to mark archived information about programs the user is interested in. If the program is archived, the address of the archived program on the database is transmitted to the user, wherein the address is a URL or "address determined by the storage manager is identifiable using a URL" (See column 2 lines 44-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the multimedia server disclosed by Ottesen in view of Shirakawa to identify the address

of stored programs as a URL, as taught by Milewski, in order to provide a more well

known addressing system thereby making it easier for the user to locate various

programs.

Claim 43 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 42 and is analyzed as

previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claims 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Ottesen et al. (US005930493A) in view of Shirakawa et al.

(US006539164B2) as applied to claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 24, 26, 28, 30, 44-48, 50-

52, 54-57, 60, and 69-72 above, and further in view of Hokanson (US006094680A).

Regarding claim 58, inherently the servers disclosed by Ottesen in view of

Shirakawa have a cost associated with it. However, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa does

not disclose selecting a server that has a lower cost relative to the other servers for

distributing data.

Hokanson discloses a system and method for managing distributed resources on

networks. Hokanson discloses multiple servers (See Fig. 1) and judges which server will

provide the requested resources based on cost/availability parameters. The system

chooses the server that has the best cost/availability parameters or "lower cost relative

to other servers" (See column 7 lines 43-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system

disclosed by Ottesen in view of Shirakawa to select a server that has lower costs

relative to the other servers for distributing data, as taught by Hokanson, in order to maximize profits and increase the efficiency of the system.

Regarding claim 59, the "cost is indicative" of the availability of bandwidth or "amount of resources need" to distribute the data (See column 7 lines 43-67).

Claim 61 contains the limitations of claims 58 and 60 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 62 contains the limitations of claims 59 and 61 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Regarding claim 64, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa and in further view of Hokanson also disclose various methods for archiving movies. The system stores movies "based at least upon their usage" (See Hokanson column 11 lines 5-30).

Regarding claim 65, the system also "generates multiple copies of media blocks to satisfy usage demands" (See Hokanson column 10 lines 35-50).

Claim 67 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 64 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 68 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 65 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claims 63 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ottesen et al. (US005930493A) in view of Shirakawa et al. (US006539164B2) as applied to claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 24, 26, 28, 30, 44-48, 50-52, 54-57, 60, and 69-72 above, and further in view of Craig (5,790,176).

Regarding claim 63, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa does not disclose archiving "media blocks based at least upon their age".

Craig discloses a media server for supplying videos over a network. Craig discloses that programs that have aged to the point of not having been requested within a predetermined time period or "based at least upon their age" are removed from on-line storage and placed in archival storage (See column 9 lines 30-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Ottesen in view of Shirakawa to archive data based at least upon their age, as taught by Craig, in order to increase storage space for high demand or new programs thereby increasing the efficiency of the system.

Claim 66 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 63 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 07 November 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 25, 27, 29, and 31 that the specification supports beginning a media block with a delta frame. Applicant cites page 21, line 24 – page 22, line 4. However, neither the specification nor the cited area, disclose beginning a media block with a delta frame. The specification does disclose that each "media block" begins with a full frame (See specification Fig. 2 and page 22 lines 4-12 and lines 17-21). Furthermore, it is well

known in the art that "delta frames" require information from other frames in order to reproduce a recognizable video image. Applicant's specification states, "all of the frames in the media content block may be viewed without reference to data regarding the other frames". Applicant's specification does not disclose how a "delta frame" can reproduce a recognizable video image without reference to the other frames.

Applicant also argues with respect to claims 1, 9, 16, and 17 that Ottesen in view of Shirakawa does not disclose beginning a media block with a "whole frame" of video data. However, reading the claims in the broadest sense, Ottesen in view of Shirakawa does meet the limitations of the claims. Shirakawa discloses the use of MPEG encoding to produce GOPs or "media blocks", where each GOP begins with an intra-frame (I-frame) or "whole frame" (See Figs. 1a and 43; column 24 lines 22-37 and column 25 line 30 – column 26 line 30). An I-frame fully describes a video image without any reference to the other frames therefore making it a "whole frame".

Applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph G. Ustaris whose telephone number is 571-272-7383. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5PM; Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JGU
March 8, 2006

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600